

CASE NO.: STL9-2000-0035-US1  
Serial No.: 09/922,182  
March 24, 2004  
Page 7

PATENT  
Filed: August 2, 2001

Remarks

Reconsideration of the above-captioned application is respectfully requested. All pending claims (1-19) have been rejected as being unpatentable over Barnett et al. in view of Landsman et al.

To overcome the present rejections, all independent Claims now recite recalling a saved advertisement, the saved advertisement having at least one link to a website, and accessing the website from the saved advertisement when the link is toggled. Claims 1-19 remain pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Barnett et al., which downloads coupons to a user so that the user can print out the coupons and take them to a store, col. 7, lines 12-15, in view of Landsman et al. Of relevance to the present claims is the allegation that Landsman et al. allows a user to access a Web site when an "advertisement" in Landsman et al. is toggled, and that modifying Barnett et al. to access a Web site by clicking on an advertisement as taught by Landsman et al. would have been obvious "to provide users with a familiar interface and an ability to access further advertisement information through the hyperlinked tags".

This rationale to combine, however, finds no support in the prior art, because there is no reason for it. Specifically, the user in Barnett et al. first accesses a Web site, then decides what coupons to download, so the user has already accessed whatever information he or she needs to decide what to buy (and, hence, to decide what coupons to download), see the abstract of Barnett et al. There is no reason for the user to again access the Web site by clicking on the coupons, because the user initially accessed the Web site to download the coupons in the first place. That is why the only use for the coupons envisioned by Barnett et

1170-3.1M2

CASE NO.: STL9-2000-0035-US1  
Serial No.: 09/922,182  
March 24, 2004  
Page 8

PATENT  
Filed: August 2, 2001

al. for the user is to print them out and take them to a store. The other coupon use - providing the supplier with demographic data - similarly does not motivate altering the electronically stored versions of the coupons as proposed by the examiner to allow the user to click on the coupons and return to the Web site.

Moreover, it would seem a stretch to combine Barnett et al. and Landsman et al. for any reason, because, while they may not be as different as apples and oranges, they are close to it. Barnett et al. teaches a system for trading coupons essentially in return for demographic data, while Landsman et al. teaches downloading advertisements to a user computer and then automatically playing multimedia content associated with the advertisements on the user computer during "interstitial" intervals (intervals between web page transitions), to free the user from any interaction whatsoever, col. 10, lines 55-60; col. 11, lines 3-15; col. 39, lines 59-67. It is true that both references have to do with the Web but the commonality ends there, underscoring the lack of the requisite *prior art* suggestion to combine them.

The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (619) 338-8075 for any reason which would advance the instant application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

  
John L. Rogitz  
Registration No. 33,549  
Attorney of Record  
750 B Street, Suite 3120  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

117n-3.AM2